arXiv:1412.7850v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 25 Dec 2014

Correspondence between phase oscillator network and classical XY model with the same infinite-range interaction in statics

Tatsuya Uezu[1],* Tomoyuki Kimoto[2], Shuji Kiyokawa[3], and Masato Okada[4]

[1]*Graduate School of Humanities and Sciences,*

Nara Women's University, Nara 630-8506, Japan

[2]*Oita National College of Technology, Oita 870-0152, Japan*

[3]*Faculty of Science,Nara Women's University, Nara 630-8506, Japan and*

[3]*Graduate School of Frontier Sciences,*

The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8561, Japan

(Dated: December 30, 2014)

Abstract

We study the phase oscillator networks with distributed natural frequencies and classical XY models both of which have a class of infinite-range interactions in common. We find that the integral kernel of the self-consistent equations (SCEs) for oscillator networks correspond to that of the saddle point equations (SPEs) for XY models, and that the quenched randomness (distributed natural frequencies) corresponds to thermal noise. We find a sufficient condition that the probability density of natural frequency distributions is one-humped in order that the kernel in the oscillator network is strictly decreasing as that in the XY model. Furthermore, taking the uniform and Mexican-hat type interactions, we prove the one to one correspondence between the solutions of the SCEs and SPEs. As an application of the correspondence, we study the associative memory type interaction. In the XY model with this interaction, there exists a peculiar one-parameter family of solutions. For the oscillator network, we find a non-trivial solution, i.e., a limit cycle oscillation.

* uezu@ki-rin.phys.nara-wu.ac.jp

Synchronization phenomena prevail in nature[1, 2] and have attracted many researchers. Among others, Winfree studied biological rhythms and introduced a phase description[3]. Later, Kuramoto proposed a seminar model of synchronization-desynchronization transitions, the so called Kuramoto model[4]. Since then, a lot of studies on the Kuramoto model and its extensions have been done[5, 6]. On the other hand, the classical XY models have been studied intensively and extensively mainly for short range interactions[7]. If the interactions are the same, complex order parameters are also the same in both models.

In the course of the study of a phase oscillator network with an infinite-range interaction[8], we investigated the classical XY model with the same interaction and found complex order parameters obey similar equations in both models[9].

It is obvious that the phase oscillator network with the uniform natural frequency is equivalent to the classical XY model with temperature 0 if the interaction is common in two models. In this paper, we report that even for the phase oscillator network with distributed natural frequencies and the XY model with non-zero temperature, there exists some correspondence between them. We treat a class of interactions for which the Hamiltonian is expressed by order parameters, and derive the correspondence of probability density functions for phases, and that between the self-consistent equations (SCEs) for the phase oscillator network and the saddle point equations (SPEs) for the XY model. We also find a sufficient condition for the probability density of natural frequency distributions in order that the precise correspondence holds in both models, and that the quenched randomness corresponds to thermal noise. Furthermore, we study the uniform interaction and the Mexican-hat type interaction on a circle, and prove the one to one correspondence of the solutions in both models. Finally, as an application, we study the associative memory type interaction. For the XY model with this interaction, there exists a peculiar solution, i.e., one-parameter family of solutions which we call the continuous solution[10]. By the correspondence, we immediately obtain the SCEs for the oscillator network. We theoretically and numerically study both models and find the continuous solution changes to a noisy limit cycle oscillation in the oscillator network.

Phase oscillator network

Let us consider N phase oscillators. Let ϕ'_j be the phase of the jth oscillator, and assume

that it obeys the following differential equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\phi'_j = \omega_j + \sum_k J_{jk}\sin(\phi'_k - \phi'_j). \tag{1}$$

Here, ω_j is natural frequency and it is drawn from the probability density $g(\omega)$. We assume that $J_{jk} = J_{kj}$, the mean value of ω is ω_0, and $g(\omega)$ is symmetric with respect to ω_0,

$$g(\omega_0 + x) = g(\omega_0 - x). \tag{2}$$

We put $\phi_j = \phi'_j - \omega_0$ and define A_j and α_j by

$$A_j e^{i\alpha_j} = \sum_k J_{jk} e^{i\phi_k}. \tag{3}$$

Since we have an interest in stationary states, we assume A_j and α_j do not depend on time. By defining $\psi_j = \phi_j - \alpha_j$, the evolution equation becomes

$$d\psi_j/dt = \omega_j - \omega_0 - A_j \sin\psi_j. \tag{4}$$

Let $\hat{n}(\phi', t, j)$ be the probability density of ϕ' for the jth oscillator at time t. Assuming stationary rotation of the probability density and defining $\hat{n}(\phi', t, j) = \bar{n}(\phi' - \omega_0 t, j) \equiv n(\psi, j)$, the continuity equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n(\psi, j) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \psi}\Big(\big(\omega_j - \omega_0 + A_j \sin\psi\big) n(\psi, j) \Big). \tag{5}$$

Its stationary solution is

$$\big(\omega_j - \omega_0 + A_j \sin\psi_j\big) n(\psi, j) = C_j, \tag{6}$$

$$n(\psi, j) = n_s(\psi, j) + n_{ds}(\psi, j), \tag{7}$$

where n_s and n_{ds} are densities for the synchronized and desynchronized oscillators, respectively. For the stable synchronized oscillators, we get

$$n_s(\psi, j) = g(\omega_0 + A_j \sin\psi) A_j \cos\psi, \ \ |\psi| < \pi/2. \tag{8}$$

XY model

The classical XY spins are denoted by $\boldsymbol{X}_j = (\cos\phi_j, \sin\phi_j), j = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. The Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = -\sum_{j<k} J_{jk}\cos(\phi_j - \phi_k) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k} J_{jk}\cos(\phi_j - \phi_k) + C, \tag{9}$$

where $C = \sum_j J_{jj}/2$. The equilibrium state is described by the canonical distribution, $P_{eq} = e^{-\beta H}/Z$ where Z is the partition function, $\beta = 1/T$ and T is the temperature. We put $k_B = 1$.

Interaction and Order parameters

We consider the following interaction:

$$J_{jk} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{l=1}^{L} a_l q_{l,j} q_{l,k}, \tag{10}$$

where $a_l > 0$ and $q_{l,j}$ are real numbers. We define the order parameters as

$$Q_l e^{i\Phi_l} = Q_{l,\mathrm{R}} + iQ_{l,\mathrm{I}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_j q_{l,j} e^{i\phi_j},\ l = 1, \cdots, L. \tag{11}$$

Therefore, in the XY model, the Hamiltonian is expressed as

$$H = -\frac{N}{2}\sum_{l=1}^{L} a_l (Q_{l,\mathrm{R}}^2 + Q_{l,\mathrm{I}}^2) + C. \tag{12}$$

By using the saddle point method, we obtain the partition function and the probability density function $n(\phi, j)$ of ϕ_j for the jth spin as

$$Z \propto \exp[N(-\frac{\beta}{2}\sum_{l=1}^{L} a_l Q_l^2 + \frac{1}{N}\sum_j \Omega_j)], \tag{13}$$

$$\exp[\Omega_j] = \int d\phi_j \exp[\beta \sum_l a_l q_{l,j}(Q_{l,\mathrm{R}}\cos\phi_j + Q_{l,\mathrm{I}}\sin\phi_j)]$$

$$= 2\pi I_0(\beta\Xi_j) \tag{14}$$

$$\Xi_j = \sqrt{(\sum_l a_l q_{l,j} Q_{l,\mathrm{R}})^2 + (\sum_l a_l q_{l,j} Q_{l,\mathrm{I}})^2}, \tag{15}$$

$$\Xi_j \cos\phi_j^0 = \sum_l a_l q_{l,j} Q_{l,\mathrm{R}},\ \Xi_j \sin\phi_j^0 = \sum_l a_l q_{l,j} Q_{l,\mathrm{I}}. \tag{16}$$

$$n(\phi, j) = \frac{\exp[\beta\Xi_j \cos(\phi - \phi_j^0)]}{2\pi I_0(\beta\Xi_j)}. \tag{17}$$

Here, $I_n(x)$ is the nth order modified Bessel function,

$$I_n(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\pi d\theta \exp[x\cos\theta]\cos(n\theta). \tag{18}$$

$n(\phi, j)$ is the so called von Mises distribution. This function corresponds to (8). The SPEs are

$$Q_l e^{i\Phi_l} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_j \int d\phi_j \exp[-\Omega_j + \beta\sum_{l'} q_{l',j}(Q_{l',\mathrm{R}}\cos\phi_j + Q_{l',\mathrm{I}}\sin\phi_j)] q_{l,j} e^{i\phi_j}$$

$$= \frac{1}{N}\sum_j \frac{I_1(\beta\Xi_j)}{I_0(\beta\Xi_j)} q_{l,j} e^{i\phi_j^0}. \tag{19}$$

Furthermore, we obtain the following relation from Eqs. (3) and (10):

$$A_j e^{i\alpha_j} = \Xi_j e^{i\phi_j^0}. \tag{20}$$

In the oscillator network, the SCEs are

$$Q_l e^{i\Phi_l} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_j 2\int_0^{\pi/2} d\psi g(\omega_0 + A_j \sin\psi) A_j \cos^2\psi \; q_{l,j} e^{i\alpha_j}. \tag{21}$$

Due to the assumption (2), the desynchronized solutions do not contribute to the order parameters.

Correspondence of integration kernels and that of randomness

Let us define the following functions and coefficients:

$$u(x) \equiv I_1(x)/(xI_0(x)), \tag{22}$$

$$\bar{g}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(x) \equiv 2\int_0^{\pi/2} d\psi g(\omega_0 + x\sin\psi)\cos^2\psi, \tag{23}$$

$$\bar{u}_\beta(x) \equiv \beta u(\beta x). \tag{24}$$

Using these functions and Eq. (20), SPEs (19) and SCEs (21) are rewritten as

$$Q_l e^{i\Phi_l} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_j A_j \bar{g}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(A_j) q_{l,j} e^{\alpha_j}, \tag{25}$$

$$Q_l e^{i\Phi_l} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_j A_j \bar{u}_\beta(A_j) q_{l,j} e^{\alpha_j}. \tag{26}$$

From these equations, we find $\bar{g}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(x)$ and $\bar{u}_\beta(x)$ correspond. If we derive the concrete equations for order parameters in one model, we immediately obtain them in the other model. We call these functions the integration kernels because these equations become integration equations in some cases as seen later. Furthermore, from the value of the kernels at $x = 0$, we have the following correspondence:

$$T \Longleftrightarrow 1/(\pi g(\omega_0))(= \sqrt{2/\pi}\sigma), \tag{27}$$

where the expression in the parentheses is for the Gaussian distribution, and σ is the standard deviation of the natural frequency ω. The correspondence (27) is also derived by comparing the phase transition points in both models. Equation (27) implies that the temperature corresponds to the width of distribution of the natural frequency around the center ω_0, that is, thermal noise corresponds to the quenched randomness.

Sufficient condition that both kernels have the same property

$\bar{u}_\beta(x)$ and $\bar{g}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(x)$ take a finite value at $x = 0$, and tend to 0 as x tends to ∞. In addition to these properties, $\bar{u}_\beta(x)$ has the following property:

$$\frac{d\bar{u}_\beta}{dx}(x) < 0, \text{ for } x > 0. \tag{28}$$

$g'(\omega) < 0$ for $\omega > \omega_0$ is a sufficient condition for the property (28), that is $g(\omega)$ has a single maximum at ω_0 and is strictly decreasing for $\omega > \omega_0$. Hereafter, we assume this property for $g(\omega)$. By using these properties, we prove the correspondence of solutions in the followings.

Correspondence of solutions

Uniform interaction $J_{jk} = J_0/N$

In this case, $l = 1, a_1 = J_0, q_{1,j} = 1$.The order parameter is defined as

$$Re^{i\Theta} = R_{\mathrm{R}} + iR_{\mathrm{I}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_j e^{i\phi_j}. \tag{29}$$

The Hamiltonian is $H = -J_0N(R_{\mathrm{R}}^2 + R_{\mathrm{I}}^2)/2 + C$. For the phase oscillator network, this is the Kuramoto model. $A_j = \Xi_j = J_0R$ and $\alpha_j = \phi_j^0 = \Theta$ follow from Eq. (3). From Eq. (25), the SCE for the order parameter R is

$$R = J_0R\bar{g}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(J_0R). \tag{30}$$

On the other hand, for the XY model, from Eq. (26) we obtain the SCE as

$$R = J_0R\bar{u}_\beta(J_0R). \tag{31}$$

Let us define $v(x)$ and $\bar{J}_0$ as follows:

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \bar{q}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(x)/\bar{q}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(0) = 4/(\pi g(\omega_0)) & \\ \times \int_0^{\pi/2} d\psi g(\omega_0 + x\sin\psi)\cos^2\psi, & \text{Oscillator,} \\ \bar{u}_\beta(x)/\bar{u}_\beta(0) = 2u(\beta x), & \text{XY model,} \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

$$\bar{J}_0 = \begin{cases} \bar{q}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(0)J_0 = \pi g(\omega_0)J_0/2, & \text{Oscillator,} \\ \bar{u}_\beta(0)J_0 = \beta J_0/2, & \text{XY model.} \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

We put $x = J_0R$ and $\xi = 1/\bar{J}_0$. Then, SCE and SPE become

$$\xi = v(x). \tag{34}$$

Since $v(0) = 1$ and $v(x)$ decreases monotonically to 0 as x increases from 0 to infinity, for any $\xi \in (0, 1]$, eq. (34) has the unique solution. Thus, there is one to one correspondence

between solutions of the SPE and SCE. The critical point is $\bar{J}_0 = 1$.

Mexican-hat type interaction

Now, let us consider the system on a circle. We study the Mexican-hat type interaction which is given by

$$J_{jk} = J_0/N + (J_1/N)\cos(\theta_j - \theta_k), \tag{35}$$

where θ_j is the coordinate on the circle, $\theta_j = 2\pi j/N,\ j = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1$. The order parameters other than R are defined as

$$R_{1c}e^{\mathrm{i}\Theta_{1c}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_j \cos\theta_j e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_j}, \tag{36}$$

$$R_{1s}e^{\mathrm{i}\Theta_{1s}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_j \sin\theta_j e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_j}. \tag{37}$$

We define $R_1 = \sqrt{R_{1c}^2 + R_{1s}^2}$. In order to indicate the location we use θ instead of j. There are three non-trivial solutions, the uniform (U) solution ($R > 0, R_1 = 0$), the spinning (S) solution ($R = 0, R_1 > 0$) and the pendulum (Pn) solution ($R > 0, R_1 > 0$). See Ref. 8 for details. The uniform solution is equivalent to the solution of the Kuramoto model. Now, let us study the stable spinning solution. $R_c = R_s$ follows. We define $\bar{J}_1$ as

$$\bar{J}_1 = \begin{cases} \bar{q}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(0)J_1 = \pi g(\omega_0)J_1/2, & \text{Oscillator,} \\ \bar{u}_\beta(0)J_1 = \beta J_1/2, & \text{XY model.} \end{cases} \tag{38}$$

We put $x = J_1 R_{1c}$ and $\eta = 1/\bar{J}_1$. The SCE and SPE become

$$\eta = v(x)/2. \tag{39}$$

Therefore, for any $\eta \in (0, 1/2]$, there exists the unique solution of (39). Thus, the solutions for the SCE and SPE correspond uniquely. The critical point is $\bar{J}_1 = 2$.

Next, we study the stable pendulum solution. We define $x = J_0 R$ and $y = J_1 R_1$. The SCEs and SPEs become

$$\xi = F(x, y) = \langle v(\Lambda(x, y, \theta))\rangle, \tag{40}$$

$$\eta = G(x, y) = \langle v(\Lambda(x, y, \theta))\cos^2\theta\rangle, \tag{41}$$

$$\langle B\rangle = \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^{\pi/2} d\theta B, \tag{42}$$

where $\Lambda(x,y,\theta)=\sqrt{x^2+y^2\cos^2\theta}$. We get

$$F(x,0)=v(x), \tag{43}$$

$$F_y(x,y)=\partial F(x,y)/\partial y<0, \text{ for } x\geq 0,\ y>0. \tag{44}$$

$$\lim_{y\to\infty} F(x,y)=0 \text{ for } x\geq 0. \tag{45}$$

Thus, for fixed $x\geq 0$, $F(x,y)$ is a decreasing function of y. For $\xi\in(0,1]$, there is the unique solution of $v(x)=\xi$. We denote it by $x_0=v^{-1}(\xi)$. Note that $x_0=0=v^{-1}(1)$. Therefore, for any $x\in[0,x_0]$ there exists the unique solution of (40),

$$y=y(\xi,x). \tag{46}$$

We have relations $y(\xi,x_0)=0$ and $y(1,0)=0$. Substituting eq. (46) into eq. (41) we get

$$\eta=G(x,y(\xi,x)). \tag{47}$$

It is proved that $G(x,y(\xi,x))$ is a strictly increasing function of x for $x>0$. Since $y(\xi,x)$ exists for $0\leq x\leq x_0$, when $G(0,y(\xi,0))\leq\eta\leq G(x_0,y(\xi,x_0))$, the solution $x(\xi,\eta)$ of eq. (47) uniquely exists. $y(\xi,0)$ is determined by

$$\xi=F(0,y(\xi,0))=\langle v(y(\xi,0)\cos\theta)\rangle. \tag{48}$$

On the other hand, because of $v(x_0)=\xi$, $G(x_0,y(\xi,x_0))$ is given by

$$G(x_0,y(\xi,x_0))=G(x_0,0)=\langle v(x_0)\cos^2\theta\rangle=\xi/2. \tag{49}$$

Thus, defining $\eta_0(\xi)\equiv G(0,y(\xi,0))$, for $\eta_0(\xi)\leq\eta\leq\xi/2$, the solution of eq. (47) uniquely exists. The condition $\eta\leq\xi/2$ implies $J_1\geq 2J_0$, and this is the condition that the Pn solution emerges from the U solution [8, 9]. On the other hand, the condition $\eta=\eta_0(\xi)$ is considered to be that the stable Pn solution becomes unstable and then disappears by merging with the unstable S solution.

Application

Now, let us consider an application of the correspondence between the two models. To obtain non-trivial results, we study the following associative memory type interaction:

$$J_{jk}=\frac{J}{N}\sum_{\mu=1}^{p}\xi_i^\mu\xi_j^\mu, \tag{50}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}^\mu = (\xi_1^\mu, \xi_2^\mu, ..., \xi_N^\mu)$ is the μth pattern ($\mu = 1, 2, \cdots, p$). That is, $a_\mu = J, q_{\mu,j} = \xi_j^\mu$. We assume that $p \ll N$ and ξ_i^μ take values of ± 1, and correlate with each other as follows:

$$\langle \xi_i^\mu \xi_j^\nu \rangle = \Big(a + (1-a)\delta_{\mu,\nu} \Big) \delta_{i,j}. \tag{51}$$

The XY model with this interaction has a peculiar solution, that is, there exists one-parameter family of solutions of the SPEs[10]. We call this solution the continuous solution. Here, we derive the SPEs of this solution. We introduce sublattices Λ_l in which the following holds:

$$(\xi_i^1, \xi_i^2, \cdots, \xi_i^p) = (\eta_l^1, \eta_l^2, \cdots, \eta_l^p) \quad \text{for } i \in \Lambda_l, \tag{52}$$

$$\eta_{l+2^{p-1}}^\mu = -\eta_l^\mu, \ l = 1, 2, \cdots, 2^{p-1}. \tag{53}$$

The number of elements in Λ_l, $|\Lambda_l|$, is $|\Lambda_l| = N/2^p$ ($l = 1, 2, \cdots, 2^p$). Order parameters are defined as

$$R_\mu e^{i\Theta_\mu} = R_{\mu\mathrm{R}} + R_{\mu\mathrm{I}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \xi_j^\mu e^{\phi_j}, \ \mu = 1, \cdots, p. \tag{54}$$

The Hamiltonian is rewritten as

$$H = -\frac{N}{2} J \sum_{\mu=1}^{p} R_\mu^2 + C. \tag{55}$$

From Eq. (19) the SPEs become

$$R_\mu e^{i\Theta_\mu} = \beta J \langle u(x_j) \sum_\nu (R_{\nu\mathrm{R}} + i R_{\nu\mathrm{I}}) \xi_j^\nu \xi_j^\mu \rangle, \tag{56}$$

$$\Xi_j = \sqrt{(\sum_j R_{\mu\mathrm{R}} \xi_j^\mu)^2 + (\sum_j R_{\mu\mathrm{I}} \xi_j^\mu)^2}, \tag{57}$$

where Ξ_j is redefined as Ξ_j in Eq. (15) divided by J. $x_j = \beta J \Xi_j$, and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ implies the average over $\{\xi_j\}$. We define the probability P_l that $\{\xi_i^\mu\}$ take values in the lth sublattice. The SPEs are rewritten as

$$R_{\mu\mathrm{R}} = \beta J \sum_\nu c_{\mu\nu} R_{\nu\mathrm{R}}, \tag{58}$$

$$R_{\mu\mathrm{I}} = \beta J \sum_\nu c_{\mu\nu} R_{\nu\mathrm{I}}, \tag{59}$$

$$c_{\mu\nu} = 2 \sum_{l=1}^{2^{p-1}} P_l u_l \eta_l^\mu \eta_l^\nu = c_{\nu\mu}, \tag{60}$$

where $u_l = u(x_l)$, $x_l = \beta J \Xi_l$, and Ξ_l is Ξ_j evaluated at the lth sublattice. By defining $R = \sqrt{\sum_\mu R_\mu^2}$, we obtain additional equations from Eqs. (58) and (59) as

$$R^2 = \frac{1}{2^{p-1}} \sum_{l=1}^{2^{p-1}} \left(\frac{x_l}{\beta J} \right)^2, \tag{61}$$

$$R^2 = \frac{2}{\beta J} \sum_{l=1}^{2^{p-1}} P_l u_l x_l^2. \tag{62}$$

The SPEs of the continuous solution are

$$c_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu} \frac{1}{\beta J}. \tag{63}$$

Hereafter, we study the case $a = 0$ for simplicity. For $p = 2$, from (63), $u_1 = u_2 = 1/(\beta J)$, and thus $x_1 = x_2$ follow. From (61), we obtain $R = \Xi_1 = x_1/(\beta J)$. Thus, the SPE is rewritten as

$$\bar{u}_\beta(JR) = 1/J, \tag{64}$$

which determines R. Thus, the continuous solution is given by

$$0 \leq R_1 \leq R, \ R_1^2 + R_2^2 = R^2. \tag{65}$$

This implies that any point (R_1, R_2) on the circle connecting two points representing patterns $\boldsymbol{\xi}^1$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}^2$ is a solution. For general p, the circle connecting any two points representing patterns $\boldsymbol{\xi}^\mu$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}^\nu$ is a continuous solution. We performed Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations for $p = 2$ and 3. We show the result for $p = 2$ in Fig. 1. We note that the trajectories of R_1 and R_2 wander but R is almost constant. As seen from Fig 1. (c), theoretical and numerical results agree quite well. Next, let us study the phase oscillator network with the same interaction. The SCE is immediately obtained by the correspondence of the integral kernels,

$$\bar{q}_{\omega_0,\sigma}(JR) = 1/J. \tag{66}$$

This is simply the SCE of the Kuramoto model. Since we have the same relation as Eq. (65), we also obtain the continuous solution. We performed numerical integrations of Eq. (1) for $p = 2$ and 3. We took a Gaussian distribution with a mean 0 and a standard deviation σ for $g(\omega)$. We used the Euler method with the time increment $\Delta t = 0.1$. See Fig. 2. There should exist continuous stationary states, but instead, we found a noisy limit



FIG. 1. XY model. $J = 1$. (a), (b) Time series of R_1, R_2, and R, and trajectories in (R_1, R_2) space obtained by Monte Carlo simulations. $N = 10^4$. $T = 0.4$. (c) T dependence of R. Curve: theoretical results, symbols: numerical results. $N = 10^4$.

cycle oscillation. The reason for this is considered as follows: In the derivation of the SPE (21), the desynchronized oscillators do not contribute. However, in numerical simulations, the desynchronized oscillators contribute to the dynamics because N is finite. Since the continuous stationary states easily move to the marginally stable direction by perturbations, the trajectories move on the manifold of $R_1^2 + R_2^2 = R^2$. This is confirmed by Fig. 2(b). Figure 2(c) on the σ dependence of R shows fairly good agreement between the theoretical results for the continuous solution and the numerical results for the limit cycle.



FIG. 2. Phase oscillator network. $J = 1$ (a), (b) Numerical results of time series of R_1, R_2, and R, and trajectories in (R_1, R_2) space obtained by the Euler method. $N = 10^4, \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}T$ with $T = 0.4$. (c) σ dependence of R. Curve: theoretical results, symbols: numerical results. $N = 10^4$.

In summary, we studied the correspondence between the phase oscillator networks and the classical XY models with the same infinite-range interactions. Assuming a class of interactions, we found the correspondence between the integration kernel of the SCEs for the oscillator network and that of the SPEs for the XY model. We found a sufficient

condition that the integration kernel of the SCEs for the oscillator network has the same feature as that of the SPEs for the XY model. That is, the probability density of the natural frequency distribution is one-humped. Furthermore, we found that the quenched randomness (distributed natural frequencies) corresponds to thermal noise. To study the correspondence of solutions in both models, we investigated the uniform interaction and the Mexican-hat type interaction on a circle. We proved that the solutions uniquely correspond in both models. As an application of the correspondence, we studied the associative memory type interaction, for which the XY model has a peculiar one-parameter family of solutions called the continuous solution. We found that the continuous solution is not stable for the oscillator network, and instead a noisy limit cycle appears, which lies on the manifold that the continuous solutions exist. We consider that this is caused by the desynchronized oscillators and is a finite size effect.

When $g(\omega)$ is the uniform distribution which is not one-humped, we can prove the one to one correspondence of solutions for some interactions in both models. This will be reported elsewhere.

For the interactions studied in this paper, there exist several types of solutions, and we found that the stabilities of the corresponding solutions in both models are the same except for the continuous solution. In order to study the stability of a solution for the oscillator network, we have to derive the evolution equations for order parameters and it is a very difficult problem to solve[11]. The correspondence of stabilities of solutions in both models is left as a future problem.

---

[1] D. S. Saunders, *An Introduction to Biological Rhythms* (Blackie, Glasgow and London, 1977).

[2] A. T. Cloudsley-Thompson, *Biological Clocks - Their Function in Nature* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1980).

[3] A. T. Winfree, J. Theor. Biol. **16**, 15 (1967).

[4] Y. Kuramoto, in : Proc. Int. Symp. on Mathematical Problems in Theoretical Physics, ed. H. Araki (Springer, New York, 1975); Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence* (Springer-Verlag, 1984).

[5] J. A. Acebrón, L. L. Bonilla, C. J. Pérez Vicente and F. Ritort, Rev. mod. phys. **77**, 137

(2005), and papers cited therein.

[6] R. E. Mirollo and S. H. Strogatz, J. Nonlinear Sci., **17**, 309 (2007); J. P. L. Hatchett and T. Uezu, Phys. Rev. E **78**, 036106 (2008); J. P. L. Hatchett and T. Uezu, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., **78**, No.2, 024001 (2009); H. Chiba and I. Nishikawa, Chaos, **21**, 043103 (2011);

[7] For example, H. E. Stanley, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, ed. C. Domb and M. S. Green (Academic Press, London, 1974) Vol 3, p. 486.

[8] T. Uezu, T. Kimoto, and M. Okada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., Letters, **81**, No. 7, 073001 (2012); T. Uezu, T. Kimoto, and M. Okada, Phys. Rev. **E 88**, 032918 (2013).

[9] T. Kimoto, T. Uezu and M. Okada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., **80**, No.7, 074005 (2011); T. Uezu, T. Kimoto, and M. Okada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., **81**, No.6, 064001 (2012).

[10] T. Kimoto, T. Uezu and M. Okada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., **82**, No.12, 124002 (2013).

[11] E. Ott and T. M. Antonsen, Chaos **18**, 037113 (2008); E. Ott and T. M. Antonsen, Chaos **19**, 023117 (2009); E. A. Martens, E. Barreto, S. H. Strogatz, E. Ott, P. So, and T. M. Antonsen, Phys. Rev. E **79**, 026204 (2009); D. Pazó and E. Montbrió, Phys. Rev. E **80**, 046215 (2009).